



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

VOL. III.

No. 9.

I.—NONIUS MARCELLUS.

I.

The name of Nonius Marcellus is associated, in the minds of most persons who have thought it worthy of remembrance at all, with grammatical dulness and ignorance. At the same time his work *De Compendiosa Doctrina* is, in its way, of such importance, if only on account of the numerous quotations from ancient Latin authors which it contains, that no student of Latin can afford to ignore it. More than this, it is incontestable that many among the notes of Nonius are of great value in themselves, and many again deserve notice, if not from their intrinsic merit, at least as illustrating a particular phase of philological criticism among the ancients. But it is not only in detail that the *De Compendiosa Doctrina* deserves attention and requires a correct appreciation. Nonius occupies an important position, not only in the history of Latin grammar and criticism, but in that of Latin literature, so far at least as his work can be shown to stand in organic connection with the literary tendencies of the age in which he lived. It is mainly in this light that I propose, in the following remarks, to consider the work which bears his name.

The flourishing province of Africa, an account of which and of its organization is given by Mommsen at the beginning of the eighth volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum*, contributed, from the end of the first century A. D. and onwards, many names of mark

to the history of Roman literature. Juvenal calls it in his time¹ *nutricula causicorum* ; had he lived two centuries later he might have called it the nurse of professors. It is true that Africa cannot rival Spain in the lustre of her literary renown ; she can show no Seneca, or Martial, or Lucan, or Quintilian. To have accomplished as much as this would have been impossible to writers so far removed, in point of time, from the age of the republic and the early empire. But, to say nothing of the Christian authors, Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius and Augustine, Africa produced several men eminent, as eminence went in that age, in science and the higher philological criticism. Caelius Aurelianus, the writer on medicine, was, like Arnobius, a native of Sicca ; Fronto, the tutor of Marcus Aurelius, came from Cirta, the scholar and poet Sulpicius Apollinaris from Carthage, Apuleius, the able sophist and devoted student, from Madaura, and Nonius Marcellus from Thubursicum in Numidia. Thus the study of the ancient Roman literature was early domesticated in the province of Africa.

Of Nonius himself we know no more than what is told us by the title of his book and by an inscription found at Thubursicum. The title of the book is *Nonii Marcelli Peripatetici Thubursicensis De Compendiosa Doctrina ad Filium*. The work then is educational, and intended by its author for the benefit of his son, like the metrical treatise of Terentianus Maurus, and the commentary of Tiberius Claudius Donatus on the Aeneid. From the addition *Peripatetici* it would appear that Nonius was a pronounced Peripatetic, just as Apuleius of Madaura in the second century was a pronounced Platonist. The word *Thubursicensis* brings us to the inscription found at Thubursicum, and published first by Renier and recently by Wilmanns and Mommsen in the eighth volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (No. 4878): *Beatissimo sa[eculo d. n.] Constantini Ma[ximi] semper Aug. et [Crispi] et Constantin[i] nobb. Caess.] plateam veterem [omni] lapide spoliatam Nonius Marcellus Herculus so[lide] constravit [et ther]mas et ce[tera rui]na dilap[s]a aedificia].* The stone belongs then to the year 323 A. D., and Mommsen very naturally identifies Nonius Marcellus Herculus with Nonius the scholar. If we may rest content with a strong probability, we may infer that Nonius, besides being a scholar and the professed adherent of a philosophical school, was a man of some wealth and social standing in his own city. His assumption of the title *Peripateticus* justifies us in con-

cluding further that he was not a Christian; the contents of his book prove that he was an eager student of ancient and classical Latin. He may fairly therefore be classed, for literary purposes, among the non-Christian scholars and antiquarians of the fourth and fifth centuries; with Servius the commentator on Vergil, Macrobius, and the elder Symmachus.

As I have elsewhere¹ observed, the work of Nonius contains only a very few quotations from any author later than the Augustan age. The exceptions to this general rule only tend to prove it, for one of the later citations is from Apuleius, and the others are from Septimius Serenus, both Africans, and both almost pedantic students of antiquity. It is worth while to trace, so far as is possible, the course of this curious reaction in favor of the past, which is a notable phenomenon in the history of the later Latin literature. Suetonius tells us² that the memory of the ancient writers had perished at Rome by the middle of the first century A. D., though it still survived in the provinces. This fact may have been in great measure due to the success of the Augustan writers, Vergil, Horace, Livy, and Ovid, in the field of literature, and still more in that of education, where Vergil and Horace soon drove out the older poets from the curriculum of study. But a reaction set in during the latter half of the first century, which was favored partly by the tendencies of literary taste, and partly also by the growth of the science of grammar and criticism. Of the literary tendency we have a suggestive record in the *Dialogus de Oratoribus* of Tacitus, which shews that a large party among the *litterati* of Italy preferred the ancients, meaning by them Cicero, Caesar, Lucretius and their contemporaries, to the Augustan authors. The way in which Tacitus speaks of the orators of the Ciceronian age confirms the already quoted statement of Suetonius. *Nescio an venerint in manus vestras haec vetera, quae in antiquariorum bybliotheceis adhuc manent, ac cum maxime a Muciano colliguntur, ac iam undecim, ut opinor, Actorum libris et tribus Epistularum composita et edita sunt.*³ It is clearly implied that the works of the ancient orators had, until quite recently, lain comparatively neglected in the libraries of the *antiquarii* or lovers of antiquity. Among these apparently we must reckon Mucianus, the able and accomplished, but profligate friend of Vespasian. These speeches were now, however, being edited in an accessible form, a fact which

¹ "Verrius Flaccus," II, p. 9.

² De Illustribus Grammaticis, 24.

³ *Dialogus* 37.

seems to indicate the existence of a revived interest in them in literary circles.

The style of the *Dialogus* of Tacitus, written about 80 A. D., shews that he at that time belonged to the antiquarian party; and the same literary tradition was continued by Quintilian. Meanwhile the critical study of ancient texts was started and considerably furthered by an elder contemporary of Tacitus, M. Valerius Probus of Berytus in Syria, who, if Jerome may be trusted, had won a reputation in Rome as a scholar at about the time when Tacitus was born.¹ The main results of his work were revised texts of ancient writers, notably of Terence, Lucretius, Vergil and Horace,² with commentaries on some of them, and a *Silva Observationum Sermonis Antiqui*, or collection of observations on ancient usage, a work which, from its title, we may infer to have been of a miscellaneous character.

By the end of the first century A. D. the critical study of the ancient authors had fairly begun. Grammar and orthography were treated by Flavius Caper and Velius Longus in the age of Trajan, and it must have been during the same period that Caesellius Vindex composed his great work entitled *Stromateus* or *Lectiones Antiquae*. This work, of which I shall have more to say below, must, if we may trust its title, have dealt mainly, if not entirely, with questions affecting the language of the *antiqui*, or Latin writers from Naevius to Vergil. Caesellius was succeeded and criticized by Terentius Scaurus, of whose treatise on orthography some considerable fragments are preserved. The coincidences between the contents of these fragments and the early chapters of the *Institutio Oratoria*, in which Quintilian touches upon questions of grammar, are so striking that it is impossible to resist the conclusion that both writers are borrowing from the same work or works, which must of course have been at least as old as the first century.

It is probably to Probus, Caesellius Vindex, Terentius Scaurus, Nisus, and Sulpicius Apollinaris, to whom we should perhaps add Varro and Nigidius Figulus, and certainly Verrius Flaccus, that Aulus Gellius is mainly indebted for the fragments of Latin criticism and erudition around which, in the *Noctes Atticae*, he has endeavored to throw the attraction of popular and literary form. The

¹ Jerome to A. D. 56.

² Suetonius *De Viris Illustribus*, p. 138 (Reifferscheid).

Noctes Atticae of Aulus Gellius, whose *floruit* is usually assigned to the years 120–170 A. D. or thereabouts, present us with the first existing example of a new form of literature. Like Fronto, the tutor of Marcus Aurelius, Gellius is devoted to the study of the *antiqui*. But the kind of study which he gives to them is very different from the rational interest and industry displayed by Probus on the one hand, and Tacitus on the other, in the age of Vespasian. The taste of Gellius is the taste of the antiquarian, whose eye rests exclusively on works of a certain period. I doubt for instance whether there is a single quotation in Gellius from Lucan, Martial, Statius, Tacitus, or Juvenal. He cites indeed some of his own contemporaries, but with this exception I think that Vergil and Horace are the latest authors whom he quotes. His own style too is marked by an affectation of archaism in language, an intentional employment of words many of which perhaps he had only learned to understand from the works of commentators and grammarians. A similar tendency may be perceived in the writings of a far abler and probably more genuinely learned man than Gellius, Lucius Apuleius of Madaura in Numidia. Apuleius, a contemporary of Gellius, is in every point of view a very striking representative of his age. It is the province of the historian to draw the moral from the vivid pictures of life and manners presented in the *Metamorphoses* and the *De Magia*. But these works also hold a peculiar position in the field of literature. The style of Apuleius, as well as his numerous historical allusions, would, even if we had not his own express testimony in the same direction, betray the fact that he had spent much time and labor, *aerumnabilis labor*¹ as he says himself, on mastering Roman antiquities and literature. It is not too much to say that no one can gain a thorough command of the material necessary for the study of ancient Latin without an intimate acquaintance with Apuleius, whose language has preserved in a living connection many words of whose existence and meaning we should otherwise perhaps have been advertised mainly through the writings of lexicographers and grammarians. His style is a curious monument of great originality and force struggling with a language which has lost half its life and significance.

It is probably a mistake to speak of the manner of Apuleius as peculiarly African. His studies of Latin were, as he himself tells us, carried on mainly at Rome and without a master; what there-

¹ Met. I, I.

fore is strained, artificial and archaic in his style is probably due simply to the intimacy which he acquired with the early writers of Italy. Not that these considerations will explain the whole phenomenon. While much of the language of Apuleius is based on antiquarian study, there is no doubt also a considerable part which represents the living popular Latin current in Africa in his time. It is interesting in this connection to compare his style with that of Tertullian, who was about a generation younger. Tertullian uses many words which are unknown to the classical Latin of Italy; but with all his rhetorical training and bias, and his love of point and antithesis, his style, compared with that of Apuleius, may almost be called popular. The difference between the labored antiquarianism of the one writer and the comparative directness and simplicity of the other, is the measure of the difference between the Pagan scholar and philosopher, and the Christian advocate.

For we are now arrived at a point where the presentiment of a great social and religious revolution is beginning to make itself felt in the reading and cultivated society of the Roman empire. The middle and the latter half of the second century is the time at which the controversy between the old and the new religions first begins openly to divide the world of letters, as well as the lower orders of the people. On the one side appear the works of Justin and Minucius Felix, on the other those of Lucian and Apuleius. The illustrious scholar Jacob Bernays, whose recent death is an irreparable loss to letters, has in various works, each of which is in its way a monument not only of learning but of art and historical imagination, helped us by clear, massive and sympathetic drawing to form vivid pictures of several scenes in the great historical drama. The social and moral conflict, parts of which he has described with the hand of a master, extended into the world of antiquarianism and of study. The same passion for a dying past which in the fourth century led Julian to throw himself, in defence of a hopeless religion, into violent opposition to the pronounced tendencies of the age, helped to inspire the scholars of the second, third and fourth centuries to study the history, antiquities, and early literature of the great empire to which they owed all the material advantages of their existence. The abler and educated advocates of Christianity, however, some of whom were converts, and had been familiar with the inside of the Pagan position, knew how to draw their advantage from their knowledge

of antiquity. While the Pagan *litterati* continued, as if by way of passive protest, simply to collect and to con over the relics of the flourishing age of Roman literature, politics and religion, the Christians, who cared comparatively little for literature and politics, destroyed the Pagan religion with the weapons offered them by the Pagan philosophy. The study of Cicero, Varro, and Verrius Flaccus was a double-edged sword, which could be turned at pleasure to the advantage or disadvantage of the polytheistic system.

Readers of Minucius Felix, Tertullian, and Arnobius will need no confirmation of this statement. But it is necessary for our present purpose to dwell for a moment on the work of Arnobius *Adversus Nationes*. Its author, whose Christianity is tempered by a curious mixture of toleration for the religion which he has abandoned, seems, like Apuleius, to have given special attention to the classical literature of Italy. His language, abounding in words taken from the ancient comedy, satire and poetry, must, like that of Apuleius, have been influenced by conscious archaism. It is no mere product of popular Latin preserved in the colonies of Africa. Arnobius has learned to know and to treat with curious and misplaced contempt many of the chief writers of the better ages of Rome, whose works are now lost. And here it is that we come at length into contact with Nonius, who, if we may trust the inscription already quoted, must have been a contemporary, as we know him to have been a countryman, of Arnobius. We have seen that the treatise of Nonius *De Compendiosa Doctrina* was probably intended for educational purposes, consisting as it does of notes on various points of grammar, lexicography and antiquities. Like the *Noctes Atticae* of Gellius, from which much of it has (erroneously as I think) been supposed to be borrowed, it is stamped with the character of pedantic antiquarianism. The range of its quotations would lead us to suppose that Nonius thought no writer worth study who lived later than the Augustan age. In this point he out-Herods some even of the scholars of the second century, who do not object to quote Lucan, Persius, and Juvenal. Taken together with the fact that Christianity is persistently ignored throughout the book, and that Nonius styles himself a Peripatetic, I think that this phenomenon justifies us in classing the work of Nonius as a product of the conservative, or I should rather say, reactionary Roman feeling which meets us again in Macrobius.

The curious contrast between the judgment shown by Nonius in his choice of authors, and his want of judgment in dealing with

them, has made him the butt of scholars, who have not, so far as I know, been at the pains to examine fully the circumstances under which his book was in all probability written. It must be remembered in the first place that the text of the *De Compendiosa Doctrina* has come down to us in a very mutilated condition. This is a fact that he who runs may read. It is not merely that many glosses are lost, but that many others have been confused, mutilated and interpolated, in a way which, unless fortune should make us a present of a better manuscript recension than any now existing, will probably make a true understanding of the whole work impossible. Making all allowances, however, for this external drawback, it cannot be denied that the book contains statements which are inconceivably repugnant to common sense. Here, however, we are brought into contact with a curious phenomenon in the history of ancient Latin scholarship. Whether from want of a true method, or from some other cause or causes, the old Italian learning seemed to lose every element of progress after the first or early second centuries after Christ. The grammarians and scholars of the second century seem to have added nothing at once new and true to the mass of knowledge accumulated in the period extending from the Augustan age to the reign of Hadrian. The material of the older Latin language was all before them, but in common with all the writers of Greco-Roman antiquity, they were ignorant of those principles of investigation which give life to the past by showing its organic connection with the present. The Latin language was changing, the old literature was passing out of the field of living interest, but as far as scientific investigation was concerned they did not know how to take advantage of the fact. There was no alternative; as science could not gain, it lost. Its representatives did nothing but repeat, over and over again, in different forms and applications, the registers made by older scholars, registers which the changes going on in their own time only prevented them from reading aright. Hence even in the scholarship of the age of the Antonines, as represented by Julius Romanus, Fronto, and Aulus Gellius, we are conscious of shallowness and want of insight, just as in the style of the two last-named authors we are struck by affectation, want of purpose, want of character. Both faults arise from a false attitude with regard to the past.

Of Nonius then, attempting as he did at the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century to take up a position which could

not be naturally maintained even at the end of the second, what could be expected but the appearance of incapacity? No improvement had been effected in scientific method, but time had gone on and continued its changes, so that Nonius was at a greater distance from the object of his study than Gellius. It can hardly be surprising then that when he ventures to add a remark of his own to the notes which he is transcribing from older scholars, he should reveal the inherent weakness of his position. Scholars who have been allowed a better reputation in the world of letters, respectable commentators such as Aelius Donatus and Servius, were guilty in like manner and for the same reason of blunders which would otherwise be incredible.

Having said so much with regard to the position of the work of Nonius in the literary history of its time, let us proceed to describe it, and to discuss the question of the authorities whom he consulted or from whom he transcribed.

As the *De Compendiosa Doctrina* has come down to us, it is arranged in twenty books, of one of which the title alone remains. Of the last or twentieth book only a few notes have survived in our existing manuscripts, and these should again be divided into two separate sets or sections, one of which should be entitled *De Propinquitare*, and the other *De Cognominibus*. Taking the work as we have it, we may classify its various books according to their subjects as follows :

1. The lexicographical books, including I (*De proprietate sermonum*), II (*De honestis et nove veterum dictis*), IV (*De varia significatione sermonum*), V (*De differentia similium significationum*), VI (*De impropriis*), and much of XII (*De doctorum indagine*).

2. The grammatical books : III (*De indiscretis generibus*), VII (*De contrariis generibus verborum*), VIII (*De mutata declinatione*), IX (*De numeris et casibus*), X (*De mutatis coniugationibus*), XI (*De indiscretis adverbis*), and some of XII (*De doctorum indagine*).

3. The antiquarian books, namely XIII-XX, (*De genere navi-giorum, vestimentorum, vasorum vel poculorum, calciamentorum, De colore vestimentorum, De genere ciborum et potuum, De genere armorum, De propinquitare*).

The method on which we must chiefly rely for discovering the authorities followed by Nonius in the various sections of his work is that of comparing, so far as is possible, his notes with those of

commentators and other lexicographers and grammarians. Nonius himself gives us no hint whatever to guide us in the investigation ; but a great number of his observations are found in the works of other writers before and after him, sometimes with the names of the scholars to whom they are ultimately to be referred. Thus by a comparison of the grammatical books of Nonius with the corresponding sections of Charisius and Priscian, it may be shown, almost with certainty, that he is largely, if not entirely indebted to Probus, Caper, and Pliny, or at least to works directly dependent upon the writings of these scholars. This part of the subject I have already discussed in the essays prefixed to the first volume of Conington's Virgil (4th edition), and may therefore pass on to the subject of the lexicographical and antiquarian books.

The first book, *De Proprietate Sermonum*, or on the meaning of words, is strictly lexicographical. Its arrangement as we now have it defies any consistent theory, and nothing is left for us therefore but to state the facts. The first point which has been noticed by all scholars who have recently dealt with the question, is that this book consists of words arranged on the whole in series each of which is distinguished by having a quotation or quotations from some one author placed at the head of the rest. Thus in the series extending from *hostimentum* (p. 4) to *examussim* (p. 9) every note begins with a citation from Plautus. Besides this it is also to be noticed that in each series, as a rule, the works of the author whose name stands at the head of each note are quoted in some intelligible order. In a Plautine series, for instance, the plays of Plautus are quoted in alphabetical order, in a Lucilian series the books of Lucilius are quoted in numerical order.

I have shown in my first essay on Verrius Flaccus that this method of arrangement is not peculiar to Nonius, but is found also in Varro *De Lingua Latina*, in Verrius Flaccus, in Julius Romanus, and in Macrobius.

But there are also signs of a rough alphabetical arrangement in many of the sets of words treated in this book. These alphabetical series sometimes coincide exactly with the series according to authors, sometimes they are included in them, sometimes they cross them. Instances of the two series exactly coinciding are to be found p. 20, *clepo corpore circus medicina* (Accius) ; p. 30, *antes camera dirus exordium inops* (Vergil) ; of one series included in the other p. 6, *calvitur frigere (de)flocare (de)pexum sartor sentina tricae*, which are included

in a Plautine series ; p. 18, *centuriatim rumen rudus rutrum tenebrio trua (e)vannare vafrum*, which are included in a series from Pomponius ; of one series being crossed by another p. 38, *combibo capital clandestino idiotas expirare eliminare incoxare*, where the end of a Lucilian series is continued by one from Pomponius. On p. 39 in an alphabetical series, *ordior pilare popolare rabere super-sedere tintinnire verminari*, the arrangement according to authors is given up altogether.

The second book, *De Honestis et Nove Veterum Dictis*, or on words used by the ancients either in a good sense or in an unusual manner, differs both in form and substance from the first. It observes the method of arrangement according to authors, but this is made also to fit in with a strictly alphabetical order. And its purport is not merely to explain the meaning of words, but to point out peculiarities in ancient usage and differences between ancient and modern form. While for instance on p. 74 we have a purely explanatory note on the word *averruncare*, we have notes on the same page explaining that *apisci* was used by Lucilius for *adipisci* and *accepso* by Pacuvius for *accepero*. It should further be remarked that the number of quotations given under each word is as a general rule much smaller than in the first book, though some words are very fully illustrated.

The fourth book, *De Varia Significatione Sermonum*, or on the different meanings which may be attached to the same words, differs again from both the first and the third. In its alphabetical arrangement it resembles the latter, but it differs from both in the immense number of quotations from Vergil which it contains. A verse of Vergil's is constantly found at the head of each article, and if not at the head, is almost certain to occur somewhere in it. In the first book on the contrary the quotations from Vergil are comparatively rare in proportion to the rest, and in the second very rare indeed. Further, the object of the fourth book is to set out in detail the various meanings which the same word may have. As this is generally done with great fullness and a great number of instances, it follows that the number of words treated in each section is comparatively small. Even so, however, the fourth book contains nearly two hundred pages, or not much less than a third part of the whole treatise.

The fifth book, *De Differentia Similium Significationum*, or on synonymes, forms the natural complement to the fourth. It is not arranged alphabetically, but (on the whole) according to authors.

As in the fourth book, Vergil is largely quoted. Precisely the same remarks apply to the sixth book, *De Impropriis*, or on metaphorical expressions.

The twelfth book, *De Doctorum Indagine*, is a mere miscellany of remarks on grammar and lexicography, in which it is difficult to discover any principle, even that of arrangement according to authors not being strictly adhered to, though there are in several instances traces of it.

What *data* are there to help us in trying to discover the authorities followed by Nonius in this part of his work?

I need not recapitulate the arguments by which in my second essay on Verrius Flaccus I endeavored to show that Nonius did not borrow from Aulus Gellius. But it is necessary to say a word on the hypothesis which finds favor with most scholars who have recently treated the subject, that Nonius had before him commentaries on the authors whom he quotes, and that his work is a series of extracts from these commentaries thrown together by him into loose order. The main support of this theory is the arrangement according to authors which meets us so often in Nonius. I have tried in speaking of Verrius Flaccus to show that Nonius might easily have found this arrangement existing in the works on grammar and lexicography which he would be likely to consult, and therefore that taken by itself the fact in question proves little or nothing. But again, if Nonius was merely making excerpts from commentaries, we should have expected one of two results. Either the whole lexicographical part of his work would have been a mere miscellany in which there would have been no sign of cohesion beyond the fact that the same authors were quoted on the same series of pages, or some other and uniform method of arrangement would have been adopted. But what as a fact do we find? That we have five books of a lexicographic character, three of which (4, 5 and 6) seem to stand in a logical relation to one another, while the other two are written for purposes quite distinct indeed and differing from those of the three first mentioned, yet not so distinct but that the same note may be repeated in each in a slightly varying form, and (which is surely important) without any hint of the fact. Such an entire want of homogeneity is surely most easily explained by the supposition that the first and second books are wholly or partially derived from separate manuals or *compendia*, and that a separate work was the source of the fourth, fifth and sixth. This hypothesis agrees very well with what we know of

other ancient works more or less similar to Nonius, as for instance of much in the grammatical treatises both of Charisius and of Priscian. Again, had Nonius really consulted the ancient commentaries, it is difficult to suppose that he could have been guilty of the numerous absurdities which have made his name proverbial among scholars. Another difficulty has occurred to me, on which, however, I do not lay so much stress. In the first and second books several of the series headed by quotations from ancient writers, such as Plautus and Lucilius, are terminated by quotations from Vergil.¹ This fact surely tells against the theory that in these cases at least Nonius was consulting any of the older commentators on the ancient poets. None, for instance, of the known commentators on Plautus, with the exception of Terentius Scaurus, lived late enough to have quoted Vergil; and in the case of Lucilius we know of no regular commentary later than that of Curtius Nicia in the Ciceronian age.

The most natural supposition with regard to Nonius is in my opinion that his authorities are mainly the works of the scholars and antiquarians of the period which extends from the reigns of Nero and Vespasian to those of Trajan and Hadrian. All internal evidence points this way, and there is also some external evidence which, without being decisive, is worth putting together.

We know to a certain extent what writers on Roman antiquities and philology were read or consulted in Africa in the third and fourth centuries. Tertullian (*De Spectaculis* 5) expressly mentions Suetonius as one of his authorities on the subject of games. On civil and religious antiquities it is abundantly clear that Varro must have furnished a great deal of information to Arnobius. But Arnobius shows also that he had paid attention to grammar and philology, and does not leave us altogether in the dark as to the authors whose works were read in his age and country. Taunting² his Pagan adversaries with their uncertainty on matters of grammar, "You do not know," he cries, "whether it is right to say *haec utria* or *hos utres*, *caelus* or *caelum*, *pilleus* or *pilleum*, *crocus* or *crocum*, *fretus* or *fretum*, *pane* or *panis*, *sanguis* or *sanguen*, *candelaber* and *iugulus* or *candelabrum* and *iugulum*, and from this uncertainty in such and similar matters you are not free, although you know by heart all the Epicadi, Caesellii, Verrii, Scauri

¹ *E. g.* p. 6, *exercitum*, Plautus, Lucretius, Afranius, Vergilius. P. 14, *extorris*, Accius, Turpilius, Sallustius, Vergilius; and more might be quoted.

² 1, 59.

and Nisi." Here then is distinct evidence that the works, or some of them, of Epicadus, Caesellius, Verrius, Scaurus and Nisus were current among students of Latin philology at the beginning of the fourth century A. D.

Let us see how this fact bears upon the question of the authorities consulted by Nonius. There are some traces of the fact that he and Arnobius were familiar with the same or at least with similar manuals; thus these very words which Arnobius quotes as of doubtful gender are all found (with the exception of *iugulus*) in the third book of Nonius *De Indiscretis Generibus*; and again in the twenty-third chapter of his second book Arnobius, in his rhetorical manner, recites long lists of articles of dress and furniture which remind the reader of the fourteenth and fifteenth books of Nonius. That Arnobius was familiar with the *De Verborum Significatu* of Verrius Flaccus, or at least that he occasionally consulted it, is rendered almost certain by his remarks in 7, 24 on *offa penita*, *polimina*, *caro strebula*, and *ruma*,¹ which correspond almost verbally with notes preserved by Festus. Much of the first and of the later books of Nonius is undoubtedly to be referred ultimately to Verrius. Epicadus, a scholar of the Sullan era, is known to have written a work *De Cognominibus*, but there is no certain evidence of this book having been known either to Nonius or Arnobius. Nor can we say whether Nonius was at all indebted to Nisus or Terentius Scaurus, for of Nisus very little remains, and of Scaurus nothing which brings him into relation with Nonius.

Of Caesellius Vindex there is, fortunately, more to be said. He was a scholar of the age of Trajan, and the author of a work called *Lectiones Antiquae* or *Stromateus*. From Charisius (p. 195 Keil) we know that this treatise contained at least fifty *libri*, which, as Julius Romanus informs us (ap. Charis. p. 117), were arranged alphabetically, some letters including more than one *liber*. Caesellius Vindex is quoted by Gellius 2 16 5 on the meaning of the words *postumus* and *longaevus* in Aeneid 6; 3 16 11 on *Morta* in Livius Andronicus; 11 15 2 on the termination *-bundus* in *errabundus*, *iudibundus* and the like, 20 2 2 on the word *siticines*. Some remarks of Caesellius on points of grammar are preserved by Priscian 1, p. 210, 230, and by Julius Romanus (Charisius, p. 117 and 239).

If these scanty indications warrant us in inferring anything, they would seem to show that the *Lectiones Antiquae* of Caesellius, if

¹ See Festus, pp. 242, 234, 313, 271.

not a lexicographical work, included much lexicographical information together with notes on points of grammar, illustrated, as its title would lead us to expect, from ancient authors. There is no direct evidence that Nonius consulted the work of Caesellius. The first book of Nonius must indeed, I think, be quite independent of it; for the note on *siticines* on p. 54 corresponds exactly with that in Gellius 20 2, and comes apparently from Ateius Capito. There is however a point which brings the second and the eighth books of Nonius into relation with Caesellius. Gellius 11 15 mentions that Caesellius erroneously supposed adjectives in *-bundus*, such as *errabundus*, *ludibundus*, and the like, to be equivalent to present participles. This doctrine, which is also repudiated by Diomedes (p. 402 K.) or his authority, is affirmed five times by Nonius, three times in the second book (pp. 103, 122, 186), and twice in the eighth (pp. 491, 509).

Besides the *Lectiones Antiquae* of Caesellius Vindex, the only great work likely to have contained lexicographical matter that we know of as having been compiled subsequently to the *De Verborum Significatu* of Verrius Flaccus was the *Pratum* of Suetonius. This work we know to have been long used as a work of reference on points of antiquities, and there are fair grounds (as I shall endeavor to point out in due time) for supposing that much of the information contained in the latter or antiquarian books of Nonius came either from it or from Verrius Flaccus. Another very important work which undoubtedly contained much information on points of grammar and usage was the *Silva Observationum Sermonis Antiqui* of Valerius Probus. Whether this work contained lexicographical matter as well it is impossible to say; but I suspect that Gellius owed a great deal to it, and it is not impossible that the fourth, fifth and sixth books of Nonius, which evidently are based on the work of a great student of Vergil, are to be traced directly or indirectly to Probus. But however the case may stand with regard to this or that particular work of reference, I have little doubt that the authorities of Nonius are in the main the same as those of Gellius, and therefore, at least, include handbooks based upon the works of Verrius Flaccus, Caesellius Vindex, Probus, and Suetonius. That a number of such handbooks existed in the second century we know from the express testimony of Gellius himself, Praef. 5 foll. *Nam quia variam et miscellam et quasi confusaneam doctrinam conquisiverant, eo titulos quoque ad eam sententiam exquisitissimos indiderunt. Namque alii MUSARUM in-*

*scripserunt, alii SILVARUM, ille πέπλον, hic Ἀμαλθείας κέρας, alius κηρία, partim λειμῶνας, quidam LECTIONES SUAE, alius ANTIQUARUM LECTIUNUM, atque alius ἀνθηρῶν et item alius ἐδρημάτων. Sunt etiam qui λόγους inscriperunt, sunt item qui στρωματεῖς, sunt adeo qui πανδέκτας et Ἐλικῶνα et προβλήματα et ἐγγχειρίδια et παραξιφίδας. Est qui MEMORIALES titulum fecerit, est qui πραγματικά et πάρεργα et διδασκαλικά, est item qui HISTORIAE NATURALIS, est παντοδαπῆς ἱστορίας, est praeterea qui PRATUM, est itidem qui πάγκαρπον, est qui τόπων scripsit. Sunt item multi qui CONIECTANEA, neque item non sunt qui indices libris suis fecerint aut EPISTULARUM MORALIUM aut EPISTULICARUM QUAESTIONUM aut CONFUSARUM, et quaedam alia inscripta nimis lepida multasque prorsum concinnitates redolentia. And the aim which Nonius had in view may be well described in the words of Gellius l. c. § 13, *primitias quasdam et quasi libamenta ingenuarum artium dedimus, quae virum civiliter eruditum neque audisse umquam neque attigisse, si non inutile, haud quidem certe decorum est.**

It is due to the scholars whose opinions I endeavored to controvert in my two essays on Verrius Flaccus that I should exhibit in all possible detail the evidence on which I have based my own conclusions. I have therefore written out all the passages in the first book of Nonius to which parallels can be adduced either from Verrius Flaccus or from later commentators and grammarians, hoping to deal on a future occasion with the other lexicographical and antiquarian books in a similar manner. The facts, so far as I have been able to collect them, will thus be in possession of the reader, who will draw his own inferences from them.

HENRY NETTLESHIP.

(To be continued.)